

PETITION

OF

JOHN SARCHET,

In relation to the Tariff.

JULY 20, 1842

Referred to the Committee on Finance, and motion to print referred to the Committee on Printing.

JULY 25, 1842.

Ordered to be printed.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled :

Your petitioner begs leave respectfully to represent :

First. That the bill submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury, was it to pass into a law, would not operate, generally, as a revenue law; on the contrary, in many of its provisions it would operate as a prohibition on many articles, as your memorialist will show.

It also proposes an entire departure from the compromise entered into in 1833. It ought not, therefore, to pass in to law, as it would be a manifest and flagrant breach of principle. The manufacturers said then that they only wanted time to perfect themselves, &c.; they have now had ten years, and are not better satisfied, nor nearer the end sought for, than they were twenty years ago.

The duty on flannel, as proposed by the first section of the bill, is *intended to be prohibitory*. The bill proposes a duty of 14 cents the square yard, so that in lieu of the law being a revenue law, was it to pass, it would be prohibitory, as here it proposes a duty of 14 cents on an article which may be bought for 8 cents, being 180 per cent. This kind of flannel is the coarse used by the poor, while the duty on the fine article used by the rich, costing 56 cents the yard, the duty on such is only 25 per cent.; thus laying a tax of \$1 80 on the poor man's dollar's worth of flannel, and only 50 cents on the \$1 12 of the rich, discrimination in favor of the rich 130 per cent. and upwards; the same of baizes. Thus taxing the poor from *three to six* times higher than the rich. For further information see "an exposition of the tariff," laid before Congress in 1832, page 39. The same bill proposes a duty of 12½ per cent. only, on laces, galloons, tresses, tassels, knots, stars of gold or silver, embroideries, &c.; so that luxuries are to be comparatively *free*, but necessities taxed to prohibition, to support pauper manufacturers (this is only using their own words when they speak of foreign manufacturers).

The duty proposed by the bill, on manufactures of cotton, is likewise deceptive and calculated to mislead; it says, "On all manufacture of cotton, or

Thomas Allen, print.

of which cotton shall be a component part, not otherwise specified, a duty of 25 per centum ad valorem, &c.: *Provided*, That all manufacture of cotton, &c., not exceeding in value 25 cents per square yard; shall be valued at 25 cents the square yard; and if dyed, &c., not exceeding in value 30 cents per square yard, shall be *valued* at thirty cents the square yard." Sec. 2, article second.

These two last articles mentioned in the foregoing clause of the bill, are prohibitory on all cottons, either white or printed, of the prices or qualities mostly worn, and include nearly all worn by the poor. Your petitioner bought plain white cotton at one penny per yard in the south of England last year, a penny being exactly two cents; the operation of the duty would be exactly 325 per cent., as the proviso would take it as costing 25 cents the square yard. Your memorialist bought also some prints, for which he paid 6 cents or 3 pence per yard, these by the proviso would pay a duty of 150 per cent., and lower price in proportion higher; these prints would all be supposed to have cost 30 cents per yard, they cost only 6. Your petitioner exhibited some of the plain white cotton to a house largely in the business in this city, and was told that the house was then paying 6 cents per yard, by the dozen of bales, and that is the price now; that is, cottons of low price are now 200 per cent. higher in Philadelphia than in England. The taxes on plain and printed cottons being by far the greatest on those qualities used or worn by the poor or working class.

This was not an accidental occurrence, the price current at Manchester shows that good plain cottons sold at 3 shillings, or 72 cents, the piece of 28 yards; and by the last arrival of the Caledonia, it was stated in the Manchester papers that cotton goods were lower than ever. Now, on such as cost 72 cents the piece, the duty would operate 250 *per cent.* And this under the guise or pretence of being only 25 per cent.; not one person in one hundred would suppose it to be otherwise, except the manufacturers; and this mode of laying taxes being purposely adopted to cheat the mass of the people into the belief that they were only paying a tax of 25 cents on the dollar, when, in point of fact, the duty is and was intended to be prohibitory, whether the Secretary knew it or not I do not say. But this I do say, that such duty would operate as a *tribute* of, at the very least, 200 *per cent.* paid to the manufacturer on the low price goods.

The fourth section proposes the same absurd taxes on iron. At the very first outset it proposes a duty of \$10 per ton on pig iron, which is over 100 per cent. on some kinds of pig metal. Your memorialist was shown iron ore within seven miles of Glasgow, in 1838, which was then largely worked, and has materially increased since then. This ore, when taken from the mine, is of the common kind, yielding about 33 per cent., but being the black-band, or mixed with coal, it calcines itself, by simply putting fire with a few coals on the weather or windward side of the heap; after this operation (which is called roasting in this country) is gone through, it then yields 70 pounds of pig metal to the 100 pounds of ore, and does not cost £2 per ton to the manufacturer. On such iron the proposed duty would be, as before stated, over 100 per cent.; yet this iron in working, like other pig, loses nearly half its own weight. Mr. Mitchell, in his examination before the committee of Congress, said it lost in Pennsylvania one third of its weight to make it in to bars, so that, in point of fact, the specific duty is not on 2,240 pounds, but on 1,120 pounds to 1,700 pounds.

The bill proposes a duty of 3 cents per pound on slit rods, and rods from

three sixteenths to five eighths : this latter size, and often nine sixteenths, is sold with larger sizes of bar iron, and this is the first bill that proposes to lay a higher duty on it than on other bar iron.

The average price of bar iron in England this year (1842) was stated in Parliament, by Sir Robert Peel, to be £6 per ton, or \$28 80 at \$4 80 to the pound sterling. The five eighths and large size slit rods, on which a duty of 3 cents per pound is proposed, cost \$28 80; so that the duty would be \$67 20 on the former sum, or very near 275 per cent.. In 1830 to 1832, the same kind of iron sold in Wales at £4 5s. per ton, and what has been *may be again*; at that price, the proposed duty would be upward of 333 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. ! being more than *eleven times* the duty proposed by the same bill to be laid on hardware—on the manufactures from that very same kind of iron—thereby giving a bounty to the foreign manufacturer over the American, equal to the amount of duty on the iron over that on hardware; in other words, of something like 300 per cent. on the raw material, &c. !! This, indeed, is protection with a *vengeance*. The blacksmiths of Philadelphia, in their sensible petition to Congress in 1832, asked that the same rate of ad valorem duty should be laid on iron, as that on hardware (which was then 25 per cent.); and they clearly demonstrated the then working of the iron duty, which was then less onerous than that proposed by the Secretary's bill; to which petition your memorialist begs leave to refer your honorable House, as a document unanswered and *unanswerable*. It was printed by order of the Senate, and is, therefore, in the archives of that honorable body.

Your memorialist has oftentimes weighed the produce of 112 lbs. of nine sixteenths and five eighths iron, made into topsail ties and sheets (short link chains), and found it to be 91 to 92 lbs., so that the waste in working is 20 to 21 lbs. Now the duty proposed by the bill, of 3 cents per pound on the iron, would be from 60 to 63 cents duty on that part which is wasted in working; while the duty on chains of the same kind and size, would only be about \$1 80 on 100 lbs., while on the raw or bar iron, 120 lbs. being requisite to make 100 lbs. of chain, it would be *three dollars* and sixty cents !! exactly *double* the duty on the *raw* material to what it is on the *manufactured* article. But this is not all. Coal is indispensable to make chains (or other manufactures of iron), and the duty on that, with cost of importation, is 350 to 400 per cent. On this the English manufacturer pays no tax on his goods in the American markets. Such is the operation of former, and would be of the proposed law, that many kinds of hardware can be imported and pay all charges, at the price, and some under the price, that the bar iron, of the quality of which they are made, sells at in our market. Hence, our *importations* of the manufactures of iron amount on an average to \$6,000,000 annually; it was \$7,000,000 in 1836, and in 1839 it was \$6,000,000 and upward; while our importation of rolled bar iron—the kind that enters in the manufacture of hardware—was only 7,000 to 10,000 tons, at \$6 per ton, or from \$40,000 to \$60,000, exclusive of railroad iron. Our importations were 7,000 tons, previous to our importations of railroad iron. And this state of things is brought about to try to uphold a few unprofitable establishments, which cannot go on without duties of from 100 to 300 per cent. on rolled iron; and the smith is deprived of his share of business, by the enormous price that his raw material is pushed up to by the duty as above stated.

These iron masters or set of *paupers*, who are seeking to be like their

brethren supported at public expense, say they produce \$20,000,000 worth of iron a year. This is not the fact, as has just been shown. Was it not for the duty, we should be supplied with iron at about one fourth to one third of the price it is now selling at. The duty on common bar is 100 per cent., and from that up to 300, as before stated; the iron selling in England at from \$20 to \$30 per ton, has been selling for years in this country at from \$70 to \$125 per ton, taking the different sizes into consideration. Hence, in the place of being worth \$20,000,000, the same quantity of a better article might be had at \$5,000,000 to \$7,000,000: hence, the people are made to pay \$13,000,000 to \$15,000,000 annually, to keep improvement of every kind in the background, or to retard them—iron being the basis of all machinery and implements of the mechanic arts. And this sum is paid by the people to support a set of paupers, as they say that, was it not for protection (as they choose to call the tribute paid to them), they could not go on with their works. The fact is, they lack capital, knowledge, and energy, to carry on that branch of business in such way as to make it profitable and cheap. It is exceedingly mortifying to those familiar with the business, to see that we import, as before stated, \$6,000,000 of manufactures of iron, and only \$40,000 to \$60,000 of iron in the bar; (hammered iron is not used for hardware.) Thus, by our own laws, we give the foreign manufacturer nearly the whole of our hardware business, at the great detriment of the American manufacturer, who could employ three men for every one employed by the iron master, without any bounty or tribute.

The hardware merchants of New York told Congress, in their petition in 1832: "If you wish hardware manufactured in this country, you must modify the duties on iron to make it cheap."

But, said those gentlemen to Congress in their petition in 1832, "in case of war, we must be *independent* of foreign nations for iron." Be it so. But we must *also* take care not to be charged by the American iron masters *six* times the price that it was selling for during the time of the war, by the nation we were then at war with. These iron men well know they did sell theirs at that, and the quality, in proportion to the price, bad in the extreme—exceedingly bad. Knowing these facts, it behoves Congress to guard against a recurrence of similar impositions, should, unfortunately, another war occur.

It does not appear to have occurred to the iron masters, or if it has they do not perhaps think it their interest to state the fact to Congress, that by reducing the duty to 20 or 25 per cent., a saving of from \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 per annum would be effected. Then let the Government employ that sum to purchase iron, or even to half the amount saved—say \$6,000,000—the people would be also \$6,000,000 the gainers, it would purchase 214,285 tons of iron at the present price of £6 per ton, which, at the lowest selling price of our manufacturers at this time, would cost \$14,899,950, or in round numbers \$15,000,000. Thus, by a little economy, \$6,000,000 might be saved to the people and \$9,000,000 to the Government, as these gentlemen say, in case of war. This iron in a dry store would keep for centuries without injury. The same sum would purchase double the quantity of pig iron, or 428,570 tons—say 500,000 tons. This mode would certainly be more economical than that proposed by the iron men, and would set some thousands of men more to work at hardware, &c., than there is now employed in making iron; and, in case of war, it would prevent the country from falling a prey to the

rapacity of these men who are now seeking to put their fellow-citizens under heavy contributions.

Another advantage would be that, under a moderate duty, the Treasury would receive its due share, while, under the duty proposed, they would be prohibitory on many kinds of iron; so that by smuggling the bill of the Secretary through Congress, it would *cheat* the people two ways—first, by preventing importation; and second, by advancing the price to the consumer. Other smugglers only cheat the Treasury and cheapen the article to the consumers, thereby enabling them to pay other taxes with greater ease.

Mr. Coalman made a large fortune in Pennsylvania when the duty was $7\frac{1}{2}$ to $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Those who want high duties are such as are not situated in favorable situations. There was lately two or more works on the North river. Both had to get their coal from Cape Breton island or from Virginia. Such works are a detriment to the improvement of the country, and ought not to exist. One, I am informed, is being removed to the coal regions. Some of the works in West Jersey get their ore from Delaware, at a cost heretofore of \$18, for to make one ton of pig, the ore alone casting more than two tons of the like iron in Glasgow or Wales. The fact is, that iron works must be where coal and ore exist.

What has been said in reference to iron, cottons, and woollens, applies equally to glass. The proposed law is, I am told, prohibitory, operating as high as 300 per cent. on some kinds.

But the most absurd duty is that proposed on coals. The freight alone, as paid by your memorialist, was £2 11s., the double or New Castle chaldon of 2 tons 11 cwts. costing 18s. in New Castle or 300 per cent. nearly. The duty proposed is intended to be prohibitory, and not for revenue, being about 100 per cent. So that coal, the necessary fuel for making iron, woollens, cottons, and glass, is to be saddled with an enormous duty when compared with its cost of transportation, thus defeating the object in view, viz: the advance of manufactories, by taxing the raw materials so enormously high. The bill is not even drawn with common clearness; it says: "On coke or culm of '*coal*,' 6 cents per bushel." *Culm* is what we call in this country *anthracite*, and coke is bituminous coal *chared*, and the residuum of gas works, &c.

The bill attaches a fictitious value to many other things besides those mentioned, to mislead the minds of the people and make them believe that a tax of from 1 to 300 per cent. is only 25 per cent.; the highest tax being always on articles indispensable to the working class, leaving the rich to luxuriate on his Spanish cigars and other luxuries at $12\frac{1}{2}$ to 25 per cent. The highest duty being on the necessities of life, none of which it appears will be admitted under 35 to 40 per cent., and from that, as has been shown, to 300 per cent. or prohibited by a tax under a *fictitious name*.

The Secretary's bill is certainly, as a whole, more objectionable than that of 1828, which passed into a law. It may be that if a low duty was laid on small but valuable articles to prevent smuggling, your memorialist is of opinion, nevertheless, that, as a revenue duty of more than 20 per cent. shall be wanted on all our imports, no difference ought to be made. A uniform ad valorem duty, to the necessary amount to defray the expense of Government, is all that is to be taken into consideration, and if some articles evade the duty, it is not worth while to change the policy of the compromise law for a few trifling articles.

When the free trade system was begun in Great Britain by Mr. Huskisson,

the silk manufacturers asked a high duty. He told them, "Gentlemen, you will have no protection higher than a fair revenue duty of 25 per cent., to which the duty on silk will be reduced in 1830, (this he said in 1825), and if you cannot go on with your works at that, *the sooner* you turn your attention to something else the better." In 1833, the export of British silks rose to £737,404, of which £76,525 were exported to France, besides keeping £5,000,000 for home consumption. More lately the duties in that country have been brought down to 20 per cent. and an additional direct tax laid on the income of the country, thus the present tory Government carrying out the free trade principle of the former tory Government of 1825.

It may be fairly said of the Secretary's bill that it is a tissue of absurdities, deception, and favoritism. Thus rags are to be taxed only 10 per cent. or $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound, but old iron 100 per cent., while brass, new and old, is to be free, and the same of sheeting and old copper, but iron, as we have seen, is to be taxed from 100 to 300 per cent., even *old iron*, only fit to be reworked. Why this partiality? Is not iron to the smith what copper and brass is to the coppersmith and brass to the brazier? Again: *dry* hides are to be subject to the nominal duty of 1 cent per pound, salted, which are *not* worth half as much by weight, the same specific duty making the duty 100 per cent. higher than on the dry, or more. Wool, the raw material of the cloth manufacturer, over 8 cents per pound, 30 per cent. duty ad valorem, and 3 cents per pound, thus reducing the protection, as it is called, to the wool manufacturer. Why is this difference in favor of the wool grower and leather manufacturer? If the former is to be protected on wool, why not on hides? And why give the leather manufacturer his *raw* material comparatively free, and refuse the same boon to the wool manufacturer and the smith? Certainly the duty on wool ought not to be higher here than in Britain, where the annual rent of the land is as much as the purchase money here is for land.

Let there be no deception. If one trade is to be favored by having its raw materials at a nominal duty, let it be so on all; and if all are to be alike, let the same rate of ad valorem duty be on everything; and those that can not go on with a duty as is said to be wanted, of 30 to 35 per cent., then the sooner such turn their attention to something else the better for themselves and their country. The Secretary states that about \$33,000,000 per annum will be necessary to defray the expense of Government, so that the revenue accruing from the public lands shall be wanted also. And both the Secretary and Mr. Clay admits that our exports will always be the measure or index of our imports, they being less than \$100,000,000. The sum arising from duties at 35 per cent. on all our imports will not net more than \$28,000,000; but by the bill proposed, it is doubtful if more than \$20,000,000 to \$22,000,000 would accrue, as the duties would be prohibitory on many things as already stated, which prohibitory duty would unquestionably diminish our exports, for if we prohibit the importation of one dollar's worth, we by the same act prohibit the *exportation* to the same amount.

It is rather a curious fact, that the price of woollens in this country is in our seaports double the price that it is in Britain—the high duty on them, with cost of importation, profits, &c., and as they proceed west they become three times the price they cost to the English consumer. It was shown by the Boston Report in 1827–8, page 12, that each individual in Britain annually consumes \$10 of woollens; what cost there \$10 cost in the United States \$25, to take the average of the whole country, which is a greater

tax on us than all the British taxes added together, and as much more as would redeem the British national debt in less than *sixteen years*! This fact, as incredible as it may appear at first sight, is nevertheless true, and is easily proven. Thus, if we dress as comfortable and decent as in Britain, our woollens will cost us \$25, or on an average three fifths more than it cost there, being to each individual \$15 more, or £3. Supposing Parliament to repeal every tax and duty now in existence, and in lieu thereof to lay a tax of £3 per head on all the people of Great Britain and Ireland, such tax would be just equal to what we pay more than they do for the one article of dress *alone*, and that tax the present population (27,000,000) would raise the sum of £81,000,000, netting about £78,000,000; the average expense in time of peace £42,000,000, leaving £36,000,000 annually. The cost at which the Government gave for it, was £58 12s. for £3 interest, or $5\frac{1}{2}\%$ per hundred, so that the real amount of the debt is about £600,000,000. The interest thereon in 1838 was £29,461,528, hence a tax equal to the difference in the price of woollens that we have to pay more than them would in sixteen years raise the enormous sum of about £700,000,000, a great deal more than what would be necessary to pay the debt if desirable. The interest of the debt would diminish every year, as the part paid would operate as at compound interest in the inverted ratio from the common calculation. Yet all our political writers speak of the British debt as a mill-stone about the nation's neck, having never given a thought that one article of our dress, &c., was by far a greater burden than all the British expenses, including their national debt and its redemption.

The grounds on which the manufacturers, &c. ask these high duties are for the encouragement of *home industry*. What a fallacy and delusion. Their leaders, Messrs. Clay and Forward, having admitted the fact that our imports are the measure of our exports, or *vice versa*, it then must follow that the cotton, tobacco, rice, wheat, and provision growers, are the most encouragers of our *home industry*, as they employ ships who require a great deal of industry to build and navigate, and the *home industry* of those interests being in the channels prepared by the nature of the climate and soil to excel other nations in the production, they ask of Congress neither bounty, duty, or tribute, but are willing to furnish iron, cottons, woollens, &c., at 40 to 300 or 400 per cent., or rather at one half to one eighth of the price that the manufacturers of the country are willing to do, and yet much *more home industry* and *home productions* than that of the manufacturers, as the latter neither want ships, seamen, or any of that kind of industry, because they can be located with their looms, &c., in all parts of the Union, but they ask for a *tribute* of 40 to 300 per cent., and thus making both masters and operatives an army of paupers, living on the *bounty* imposed by *law* on the rest of the community to maintain them in a state of pauperism. This fact they acknowledge themselves, when they say that if a duty of 40 to 200 or 300 per cent. is not imposed on foreign labor they cannot go on with their manufactories.

They allege they need protection against, 1, pauper labor of Europe, 2, because European nations wont take our provisions and flour, and lays a duty of 1,000 per cent. on our tobacco, &c. This they apply more particularly to Great Britain.

If I prove the foregoing allegations to be unfounded, then those manufacturers, asking high duties on those grounds, will be like unto other beggars, who we call imposters, because they ask our alms under false pretences, in

order to deceive us into the act of giving them that which they are unworthy to receive.

1. Pauper labor of Europe, alluding, of course, to those countries from whom we get iron, wollens, and cottons, which is Great Britain. The earnings of these paupers of Great Britain, against whom our manufacturers ask protection, are as per following table, taken in Manchester in November, 1838 (since then there has been no change), and in Philadelphia county in April, 1840, on the return of your petitioner from Europe.

WEEK 69 HOURS.			WEEK 78 HOURS.		
<i>At a Manchester mill in full operation, card room.</i>			<i>Philadelphia county mill in full operation, same room as in Manchester.</i>		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
Bobin and jack tenders, young women	0	14 0	Adult women - - -	-	0 9 5
Thustel spinners, young women	0	12 0	Adult women - - -	-	0 8 4
Dappers, scavengers, crewel fillers	0	6 9	From \$1 34 to 75 cents average	-	0 4 4½
Aggregate weekly earnings -	-	1 12 9	Aggregate weekly earnings -	-	1 2 1½

Amount of weekly earnings in Manchester over and above the earnings in Philadelphia county, in the three branches of business in cotton mills, 10s. 11., or \$2 62. To each operative 3s. 6d., or 84 cents per week in money, and nine hours in time (with medical attendance, at the cost of the Manchester mill owner), being over fifty per cent. *more* than in Philadelphia county. As near as may be, the American operative has to give 480 hours of his labor for the same amount of money earned by the Manchester operative in 300 hours, and medical attendance, besides, free of expense.

The following table shows the amount paid in the two mills from which the above table was taken to some hundreds hands in each mill, in all the branches of business carried on in such establishments, at the same date as that of the foregoing table:

<i>At Manchester.</i>			<i>In Philadelphia county.</i>		
<i>Males.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Females.</i>	<i>Males.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Females.</i>
From 13 to 14 years	- 11	8	Over 21 years - - -	86	
14 to 15	- 18	21	Boys - - -	95	377
15 to 16	- 10	18			
16 to 17	- 5	20			
17 to 18	- 3	9			
18 to 19	- 8	16			
19 to 20	- 13	12			
Over 20 - - -	- 138	98			
	<u>206</u>	<u>202</u>		<u>111</u>	<u>377</u>
Total males and females, 408.			Total 488.		
Weekly am't paid for 69 hours of labor, £272 0s.			Weekly amount paid to the whole for 78 hours, \$1,360 - - -		
More than in Philadelphia county to			- £283 6s. 4d.		
the same number - - -			To 408 operatives - - -		
			- 239 14 0		
			Less than in Manchester - - -		
			- 32 6 0		

The average weekly earnings in Manchester for 69 hours' labor is 13s. 4d., or in dollars at \$4 80 to the pound sterling, is - - - \$3 20
In Philadelphia county for 78 hours' labor per week 11s. 9d. or - - - 2 46

average surplus earnings in Manchester for 69 hours - - - 74
being a trifle less than 33 per cent. more than in Philadelphia county in wages, and 9 hours or three fourths of a day less work in the week, the value of which is in Manchester worth 1s. 8d., or 40 cents, or about 16 per cent., which, being added to the 74 cents, make it about 50 per cent. more than in Philadelphia county, beside medical attendance.

Living for a man, his wife, and three children, is about £14 cheaper in Manchester than in Philadelphia county, including house rent, fuel, and clothing. The same rooms that let in Manchester for 2s. 6d. per week, rents in Philadelphia county for 4s. 2d., or one dollar, being 40 cents per week, or two fifths higher than in Manchester. Coals sold in 1838 at 8s. per ton (Mr. Marshall says, at page 156, report 115, first session of the 20th Congress, that "the fuel which cost in Manchester \$27 will, in Hudson, on the North river, cost \$120; the 112 lbs. of coal in Manchester cost ten cents), or \$1 99 per ton; here, in Philadelphia, on the average of the last 10 years, \$7. Two tons in Manchester is sufficient for one year; here it requires 4 tons, so that it cost \$26 10 more for that necessary of life here than in Manchester, owing to the severity of our winters. Best beef, best pieces, averaged 6d., or 12 cents per pound; in Manchester from 1826 to 1832, and was the same in November, 1838; coarse in proportion, down to 6 cents. In Philadelphia for the last 10 years [the price] has been for best 7d., or 14 cents; this year best 12½ cents, coarse 6 cents and upwards. In 1838 bread sold in Philadelphia at 6 cents or 3d. per pound; in London 2d. or 4 cents. This price your memorialist gave in that year in the two cities above mentioned. From 1826 to 1832 bread in Manchester [was] a trifle under 2d. or 4 cents on the average. Now, in Philadelphia, 2d. or 4 cents the one pound loaf. Flour is generally cheaper here than in England, but bread is not, owing to high rents and higher price of fuel; clothing double the price here to what it is England. As before stated, living is about £14 or \$67 20 cheaper in Manchester than in this county to a family of 5 persons.

The manufacturers admitted in their evidence before the committee of the House of Representatives in 1828 that wages were not higher here than in England. Mr. Siddal being asked if it was within his knowledge that cotton and woollen weavers emigrated from Europe to this country, answered, "Many do come to this country principally from Great Britain. Some of them, who are the best workmen and the most ingenious, *return* because they do not find employment suited to their capacity—that is to say, they can not earn as much here as they did in Great Britain." (Report 115, page 159.) "It is certain that he who is ingenious enough to do fine work can do coarse." At page 129 (same as last witness) Mr. Price gives the average wages of 200 operatives at 68 cents per day in 1826, and in 1827 they were reduced by the substitution of women for men. At page 128, same report, he says, "he thinks he can manufacture wool as cheap as in England, as from information he employed more females than they did in England." At page 115 Mr. Walcot says: "We can do the mere *labor* of manufacturing as *cheap* as it is done in England." Mr. Dickson, at page 111, gives the average weekly wages at \$1 69½, or 7s. ¾d. on average of the operatives, men, women, and children. The wages have been reduced in this country since

1828, the date of the foregoing evidence. In England they are still the same as in 1812. Mr. McCulloch, in his Dictionary of Commerce, page 527, American edition, "wages are estimated at the same rate in 1830 as in 1812." And in J. R. McCulloch's (I believe the same writer) Statistical Account of the British Empire, vol. 1, page 664, he gives a table of wages for 1832, remarking that "there has been no material change since then." His work was published in 1839. And at page 663 he says: "The wages of the adults engaged in factories are in general high, many of them earning from 3s. 6d. to 6s. 6d. per day, and some more;" that is, from \$5 04 to \$9 36, and some of them more than that, if in mills for 69 hours; out of mills 58 to 60 hours per week.

The cause of the continual fall in the price of cotton goods is the enormous amount of capital embarked in the business in Great Britain. From this cause the improvements in machinery has as yet never been stationary, and this is the principal reason why the manufacturers in this country can not keep up with the British manufacturer. And the next operating reason, and for which there is no remedy (except by removal), is the location of the American manufactories in a part of the country where there is no coal fire, is as indispensable to the growth and thrift of manufactories as cotton itself; hence where fuel is cheapest there is the location for manufacturers.

The high price at which iron is forced up by the duties is also a great impediment to the success of manufactories. Mr. Marshall said before the committee (report 115, page 15), "Machinery is nearly double the price in this country what it is in England." In 1833, mules carrying 300 to 324 spindles were considered very complete machines, now they are double that. "A spinner that produced 16 pounds of yarn of the fineness of 200 hanks to the pound in sixty nine hours, &c., for which he was paid 3s. 6d. per pound. This gives his gross receipt 54s., out of which he paid 13s. to assistants, leaving 41s. for his net earnings. But the power of the mule has since been doubled, that is, they now carry 648 spindles, instead of from 300 to 324, and the same spinner produces 32 pounds of the fineness of 200 hanks to the pound in 69 hours, for which he is paid at the rate of 2s. 5d. per pound, instead of 3s. 6d., his gross receipts are therefore raised to 77s.; he has now five assistants, to whom he pays 27s., which leaves him 50s. 4d. (per 69 hours)."—*McCulloch's Statistical Account of the British Empire*, vol. 1, page 665.

Although there was a reduction of 13 pence pound in the spinning, yet his weekly wages rose from 41s. to 50s. 4d., or from \$9 84 to \$12 32, a rate of wages no spinner can boast of in America, even in his week of seventy eight hours. The English week, as before stated, is only sixty nine hours.

In this country the number now in use in most mills (as I have been informed) carry only two hundred spindles, doing less than one third the work now done by the British mules. It is stated that every ten years in England the machinery has to be replaced by more improved machines, and not by tear and wear, and that the fall in the price of cotton goods from that cause is 50 per cent. every ten years. As before stated, the high price of iron operates directly against improvement in machinery. Were it permitted to be exported from England, it might be had at the difference of the duty; but there is a heavy penalty, beside the confiscation of the article, if attempted to be taken away from England.

The wages in the iron business, like in the cotton, are higher than in this country. In many instances they are more than double. Some workmen

in Liverpool get £4 per week the year round. At piece work, at the tilt-hammer, I found some making £6 per week; but £3 10s. to £4 is no rare occurrence, and that without a day's lost time. There is not a man in the United States that averages half that sum the year round. In the rolling mills the average wages the year round are from £2 to £3 per week, or from \$9 60 to \$14 40 per week. A gentleman writes me from Birmingham that the lowest wages paid to any man in an establishment employing 300 men is 25s. per week of 58 hours, or \$6, and from that up to 40s., and some as high as £3 per week, or from \$6 to \$14 40.

In Sheffield the wages of grown persons are from 21s. to 50s. for 60 hours; but most of the work is done at piece work, and some workmen earn as much as £5 per week, or from \$5 04 to \$24 per week. Many of the operatives keep apprentices, on whom they make as much as \$5 per week. For further account see James McQueen's General Statistics of the British Empire, page 130.

From the often repeated misstatements of the newspapers, an idea has gone abroad that wages were higher in America than in England, yet nothing is more susceptible of proof than the contrary is the fact. It will be admitted that if a given number of persons receive a greater sum of money per annum than a similar number in another country, they who get the greatest sum get the highest wages. In 1837 the declared value of the exports of cotton goods was £24,602,912, the declared value is known to be lower than the real value; say in round numbers £25,000,000, of which £4,000,000 raw material, leaving £21,000,000 for wages, profit, &c. Mr. McCulloch gives seven ninths of the whole amount, after deducting the cost of the raw material as wages, six ninths being for labor performed in the mill. (See his Dictionary of Commerce, pages 524 and 525, American edition.) Out of the £21,000,000 there is paid for wages £16,200,000. The exports of woollens in the same year were £8,000,000. The cost of manufacturing wool in England is as 12s. 6d. is to 10s., the latter sum being the cost of the materials. But say of the £8,000,000 four were for wages; add this sum to the former in the cotton business, the result is £20,200,000, or over \$100,000,000 of the currency in which our exports are entered at the custom-house, so that the amount of wages alone in the cottons and woollens exported by England and Wales, with a population of under 14,000,000 at that time, is more than the whole of our exports in 1840, with a population of 17,062,567. These exports were from England and Wales, except about one ninth from Scotland of the cottons; but even if we add the population of Scotland, it was then under what ours was in 1840. Ireland is not included, as it imports both cottons and woollens from Britain. The whole exports that year were £53,015,431 (exclusive of Ireland, who only exported £445,900 in that year), or \$265,077,655, being to ours, which were under \$100,000,000 in 1840, over 165 per cent. greater by about the same population of producers.

The wages paid on other manufactures than cottons and woollens, which were over £21,000,000, the part of that sum paid in wages must have been £16,000,000 more, or \$76,800,000, being very near twice the amount of the whole of our exports of domestic produce and manufactures. These exports from Great Britain were exclusive of foreign and colonial produce. Some of the exports consist almost entirely of labor, as fine watch springs, worth over twenty times their own weight in gold. Mr. McQueen, before quoted, says, at page 129, Statistical Account of the British Empire, "that 174,441 cwts.,

16,000 cwts. of which only was in hardware and cutlery, turned into £1,485,223, or at the rate of nearly £90 per ton." The first state in which this iron was made was not worth more than £2 to £5 per ton, say £3 10s. on an average, so that about 25 out of 26 parts was labor, profits, and tear and wear of machinery.

As this proves beyond all skepticism that the part of British exports paid in wages is 150 per cent. more than all our exports; hence, so far as exports are in consideration, the wages of the British artisan must be greater than that of the American, the population being the same (there is, however, 2,500,000 of the rich in Great Britain that might be fairly subtracted from the whole, as they live on the rental of their estates, &c.)

It now remains to see how wages stands in the home consumption and agricultural departments. The dates I have by me give the information for the United Kingdom for the years 1825 to 1834, so that the population of the census of 1831 will be the fair ratio for that country, and the documents I have for the United States are for the year 1840, taken with the census of that year; so that the population of the former is 24,410,429, and that of the United States 17,062,567, being a trifle over two thirds of that of the United Kingdom.

The income of the United Kingdom in agriculture, including the mines and fisheries, and forest, was, agreeably to McQueen's Statistical Account of the British Empire, page 79, £474,029,688, or, at \$5 to the pound sterling (our estimates of 1840 being made in a depreciated currency, and our gold not being so pure as theirs, this allowance will be barely enough), gives \$2,300,148,440 and that of the United States for 1840 was

- 1,171,100,092

surplus income of Great Britain

- 1,129,048,348

To be in proportion to that of the United States, it ought to have been only as 17,062,567 is to 24,410,429; but in round numbers say as two is to three, or \$585,550,046, giving a surplus profit or income to Great Britain and Ireland over their proportion, compared with the United States, to the amount of \$543,498,302, being to every man, women, and child \$22 25 more than in the United States. This sum is to be added to the surplus of those employed in producing the exports, which are as $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. (Was not Ireland included the result would be very different, the population not being employed more than one half of their time.) The foregoing surplus above given is to each of the whole population, but only 2,371,111 are employed in agriculture (see McQueen, before quoted, page 84.) Now, if we divide the surplus sum by the number of individuals employed, it gives to each \$2 25 nearly over the American agriculturist. But the number of agriculturalists in the United States are much more numerous than in the United Kingdom. By the census of 1840 they are given at 4,696,497, or nearly double the number employed in the United Kingdom.

The 2,371,111 persons produce in Great Britain and Ireland \$2,300,148,440, and in the United States 4,696,497 persons produce \$1,171,100,092, which gives to each individual employed in the United Kingdom \$970 and a fraction, and to the American producer only \$228 (difference \$742,) and a fraction to balance the other, being about 325 per cent. less each producer than the British producer.

Next is the manufacturing interest. McQueen, at page 115 of his Statistical Account of the British Empire, gives the whole income from that source

annually at £262,085,199, from which deduct what is already included with or in the exports, viz., £20,200,000, and it leaves £241,885,199; in dollars - \$1,209,425,995
 Annual produce of American manufacture - 418,075,432

Surplus manufacture in the year 1831 over ours - 791,350,563
 in 1840, or a little over three to one. The number of people employed there is 1,500,000, and in the United States 791,545, or a trifle over one half of the number in Great Britain and Ireland, each of the American manufacturers earning nearly two dollars against the British manufacturers three, or not quite two thirds as much as those called by the master manufacturers the *paupers* of Europe, against whose pauper labor they ask protection, when they get 50 per cent. more than he is giving to his own men in this country.

Lastly. The annual income of the United Kingdom, as given by Mr. McQueen, at page 218 of his Statistical Account of the British Empire, is - £722,459,797
 From which deduct, for the income of the land proprietors, tithes, manors, &c. - 88,190,778

And it gives as the clear income of the producing classes - 634,269,019
 to be divided among them all, with land free, poor rates paid, and receiving religious instruction if they chose also free. Tithes, taxes of all kinds being deducted from the gross sum - \$3,171,345,095
 And in the United States - 1,589,175,524

Surplus annual income of the working classes - 1,582,169,571
 of Great Britain and Ireland over and above the income of the United States. Mr. Montgomery Martin, in his work on the taxation of the British Empire, page 193, supposes the rich class living on their income to be 2,500,000. These are to be deducted from the gross population, as their income is deducted from the whole sum, which leaves the population producing the foregoing mentioned sum, and to be divided among them at 21,910,449, giving to the share of each individual as his annual clear income \$144 75, to each individual in America \$93 12½, being more than 50 per cent. less than the share of the English producer, including Ireland and Scotland, leaving £88,190,778 as the income of the rich and the clergy, &c., for their support, which is to each \$170 40, which sum passes again to the producing classes for supplies to those two classes.

The whole income of the nation, as stated by Mr. McQueen, at page 220, is, as before stated - £722,459,767

Expenditure for food	-	-	-	£295,479,166
“ manufactures	-	-	-	262,085,199
“ house rent	-	-	-	40,929,940
“ imports, exports deducted	-	-	-	3,505,695
“ taxes	-	-	-	51,000,000
“ tithes, poor rates, &c.,	-	-	-	16,000,000
				<hr/>
				669,000,000

Annual increase of capital - 53,459,767
 or upward of \$250,000,000.

Thus in every way we take the statement the result is the same, showing the remuneration of labor or wages to be much greater in the United King-

dom than in the United States; and was this general statement made exclusive of Ireland, the difference would be much greater, the Irish population not being employed half their time except in the north, where they manufacture linen, the state of the country being too turbulent to invite manufacturing capital and the estates being so much subdivided as not to afford labor half the time. (See J. R. McCulloch's Statistical Account of the British Empire, 1 vol., page 503.)

Let us now look at the savings of the people in their saving banks in both countries. The last date given of the reports made to Government is the 20th of November, 1840. There was then in the saving banks in England £20,203,438 or \$100,000,000, and in the State of New York, in the year ending January, 1842, \$5,499,303, in a population of 2,500,000; that of England 15,000,000, being as 1 to 6. Hence, New York ought to have in its saving banks one sixth of that of England, or \$16,666,670, or upwards of three times what it has. So that the savings of the working class in England is more than three times the savings of the same class in New York. Wales, with a population of about 1,000,000, or two fifths that of New York, has £521,918 or \$2,609,590, or nearly half that of New York. Massachusetts had on the last Saturday in October last \$6,714,181 in the saving banks, and a population of about 800,000; the white population was 728,932. Scotland had £13,000,000, (McQueen's Statistical Account of the British Empire, page 140), or \$65,000,000. The population then was 2,365,114, or about three times that of Massachusetts; so that the savings in Scotland should have been, to be equal to those of Massachusetts, \$20,152,543. It is more than three times that. Of the savings in the Chamber Street Institution, about nine tenths belong to foreigners settled in that city, as I was told.

The number of paupers in the State of New York for the year ending in December, 1841, was 77,444, of whom 9,239 *only* were foreigners, not quite 1 in 8 of the whole number. As appears by the report of the Secretary of the State, the number in the poor-house on the 1st of December, 1841, was 2,991, the same year. The parish of Liverpool has about the same population as New York, and it has seldom more than 1,600 to 1,800 inmates. In Massachusetts, the number of paupers in 1839 was 14,651, of which 2,880 were foreigners, a little more than 1 in 7.

These facts must necessarily bring us to the conclusion that the manufacturers of this country do not give as high wages as is given in Great Britain, and that they are not entitled to the protection they ask on those grounds.

2. The manufacturers say Europe will not take our provisions, alluding particularly to Britain. Like other allegations made by them in reference to our intercourse with other nations, [it] is not founded in fact. Great Britain admits our provisions to be used on board her or any other vessels in her ports (beef nor pork are not used by families in that country), and she allows the benefit of drawback on any quantity taken for ship use. There is, however, two impediments in the way of ours being used there or by the shipping that visit her shores—1st, our beef and pork are inferior to her own, particularly for long voyages, supposed to arise from imperfect curing and packing, and so stated by American residents in England. This may be in part owing to climate. It is well known that even English provisions are inferior to Irish.

And, in the second place, the price is on an average as low there as in our seaports, if not lower in Ireland. This is proven by the fact that, in the year 1837, there was exported from Great Britain \$964,085 worth. The imports

the preceding year were 15,842 cwt. of beef and pork and bacon, of which 11,548 cwt. were re-exported. Our exports of beef, pork, and bacon in the same year, to all parts of the world, was only \$623,618 worth, or about two thirds of the exports of Great Britain, and what is rather remarkable, we imported from Great Britain 36,341 pounds of beef, and 20,682 pounds of bacon, valued at \$7,806, and exported to Britain 400 pounds of bacon, valued at \$40; and, beside all her exports, there was kept at home 115½ pounds of beef, veal, and mutton, and 48 pounds of pork, being 163½ pounds of meat to every man, woman, and child in Great Britain and Ireland per annum.—*McQueen's Statistical Account of the British Empire*, pages 37 to 43.

Bread-stuffs: so far from it being the fact that Great Britain does not admit our bread-stuffs, she is one of our best, if not the best customer we have, including her colonies. The operating duty, since 1827, that the law went into operation, has been only eight shillings per quarter, which is less than our duty on her Canada wheat, of which we imported considerable quantities in 1837. Joseph Hume, Esq., M. P., stated, in debate on the corn laws, that the British corn grower was entitled to 5 shillings duty per quarter, because landed property paid taxes to that amount, at the discharge of the other interests of the country. Mr. J. R. McCulloch says the corn grower is entitled to 6 or 7 shillings per quarter. Both these gentlemen were free-trade men, and adverse to the corn laws; so we may conclude they did not overrate the amount the corn grower was fairly entitled to. Taking, then, the tax or excise indirectly imposed on the corn grower at six shillings per quarter, it leaves the operating tax on that imported from foreign countries, 2 shillings per quarter for protection, the other 6 being revenue equally paid by the home-grown article, as from the returns made to Parliament, the average duty paid on that taken for home consumption has only been 8 shillings per imperial quarter. The average price of wheat has been about 60 shillings, so that the operating duty over and above that paid by the home-grown corn, has been only *three and one third* per cent. ! and, if taken by way of Canada, it has been admitted on better terms; that is, at *less* duty than that grown in *Britain and Ireland*. The Canadian route is the cheapest, being the natural outlet, and the most convenient for all the western and northwestern States, as it is proven by the fact that last year there was transported through the Welland canal from United States ports to United States ports, 962,142 bushels of wheat, and 11,250 barrels of flour. These facts need no comment.

The leading cause why so little of our bread-stuffs go to Europe, is, the high price at which they are held. The millers and flour-dealers well know that the exports, when compared with the home consumption, are very trifling in amount; so when flour advances one shilling sterling abroad, they advance theirs two in this country, because it is their interest to do so. The city of Philadelphia alone consumes as much as the whole of our exports in 1837, when they were 318,719 barrels; and in 1838, they were 448,161 barrels—one *third* of the whole taken by Great Britain and her colonies, and about one *half* of our corn and corn meal (Indian.) The consumption, *per capita*, in Britain, is one quarter; a quarter is eight imperial bushels; that bushel is one thirtieth part larger than the Winchester. At that rate, this city alone consumes more than our exports in either of those two years. The exports of flour, &c. is not one two-hundredth part of the home consumption; hence the increase in price for what is consumed at home, is more than 199 to 1. This fact is proven from experience. The Channel island

import all their bread-stuffs, say 80,000 imperial quarters per annum. (They export that of their own growth to England free, as Canada.) Vessels both from Guernsey and Jersey have tried to get wheat here, but it was cheaper to them from the Baltic; and even when flour is taken to London or Liverpool, at the low rate of two shillings per barrel, although there are regular packets trading from those islands to the above-stated points, very little flour is taken out of bond to go to those islands, where it is as free as the air we breathe, no duty or tariff being known in those islands, where the population is 1,000 to a square mile. Thus proving that [if] flour will not bear two shillings, or 48 cents per barrel for cost of transportation, it cannot compete, in a free market, with that of the Baltic. The manufacturers pretend they open a large market for flour, &c., &c. The two cities of New York and Philadelphia, including Brooklyn and Camden, N. J., consume more of all kinds than the whole of the manufacturers put together. The population of these places is over 600,000 souls, whose bodies require food. Then there is the provisioning of all the ships which trade there. All these depend on commerce. The whole manufacturing population is only a little over 700,000, and, as it is stated that the hands are generally young people, from one to two hundred miles distant, there are no families to add to their number. And, again, one half of those manufacturers would continue to manufacture if no tariff existed. Again, the States of Virginia, the two Carolinas, and Georgia, added more to their population from 1820 to 1830, (I have not the late census) than the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Vermont, per cent. I think three eighths of one per cent. more, insomuch that manufactures have not created more demand for labor than the old planting States. The latter are willing to supply us with cottons, woollens, iron, &c. without a tariff, and all by *home* industry too.

The manufacturers say Europe will not take our tobacco. In fact, the manufacturers grow none; hence they have none to dispose of. It appears that France, Holland, and Germany grow half their consumption, including Austria. Great Britain prohibited its growth at home, in favor of Virginia, then a colony, and latterly the growth has been prohibited in Ireland.

Foreign tobacco is subjected to a duty of 3s. 6d., and colonial or English, grown in any British plantation, to 3s. per pound. The trade of growing tobacco for the British market is, therefore, perfectly free for those that choose to embark in it: the duty is not protective, but for revenue.

It is probable that a duty of 35 per cent. will be imposed on British cloths. Suppose Congress at the same time, in way of retaliation, impose an excise of 30 per cent. on all American made cloths, which would be exactly in proportion to the British duty on tobacco: the English grower paying six sevenths of the tax on foreign. So 30 per cent. on *home* made cloth would be six sevenths of 35 per cent., the duty on foreign. The same on cotton, iron, and other things we make, similar to those we import. If our manufacturers are not ready to adopt so liberal principles of policy toward foreign nations, why then do they make such ado about a more liberal policy than they are willing to adopt toward others.

Having now disproved the allegations of the manufacturers, and shown that many of the proposed duties are not intended for revenue, but *intended* to be *prohibitory*, yet the duty to be laid in such way as not to be perceived by the mass of the people; the duty being either, as those on plain and printed cottons. First, it was to *deceive* the people, making them believe

that they are only paying a duty to go into the Treasury of 25 and 30 per cent., while, in point of fact, that rate applies only to fine goods, used most by the *rich families*, costing 25 and 30 cents, and over that price, the square yard, and all costing less than 25 cents for plain and 30 for printed the square yard, which includes the great bulk of both, pays from over 25 and 30 per cent. to as much as 325 per cent., as has been shown in its proper place; but it is not duty that it pays, as none can be imported at those rates of tax—it is tribute to the manufacturers that it pays. On other things, specific duties, without reference to their first cost, amounting thereon to from 100 to 300 per cent. on iron, glass, baize, flannel, &c., &c. Let these duties appear in their true forms without disguise, and there will not be found one person in a thousand to support them, the manufacturers excepted: on the other hand, a duty for revenue, based on the compromise law of 1833, and not one in a thousand will be found opposed to it!

Let us now consider the number of manufacturers, and those of them whose business cannot support itself without being chargeable to the other industry of the country, like other paupers are to their parish, ward, or township. By the census of 1840, the number of persons employed in *trades* and manufactures was 791,454; of these 400,000, or more than one half, are trades people, such as smiths, carpenters, shoemakers, shipwrights, and of the other multifarious trades and business, who have never asked *alms* or for support from their fellow-citizens, but supported themselves independent and honorably. Of the others, there is at least more than one half that can support themselves, independent of poor rates, or protection, as these rates are usually called. In the interior, there are many woollen manufactories that work on the shares or take wool for pay, and need no Government support. The same may be said of all the iron works in suitable situations; these are all protected in the enjoyment of the western markets, and, if well managed, can bid defiance to competition from foreign iron, owing to the cost of transit. The eastern markets or seaboard they cannot supply, neither will they be able to monopolize it. Before any cotton establishments as factories existed, large quantities of that staple was manufactured in families. In 1834, the cotton manufacturers estimated their number at only 18,472 men, 38,827 females, and 4,691 children under 12 years of age, or 61,997, and hand-loom weavers, 4760. If we suppose as many woollen manufacturers needing support, the whole would be 133,514 paupers, for whose support the rest of the people are made to pay on woollens \$15 *per capita*—say 6,000,000, who make no part of their clothing, but either wear that imported, and pay duty into the Treasury thereon, or use that made in the country, and pay the same per centage in *tribute* to the manufacturer at home, leaving 11,000,000 of the people to manufacture their own clothing, including the manufacturers themselves: the latter in factories, the former in their own household. (And it is a remarkable fact that, among the farmers, where the household mode of providing their cloths has been adopted, they are more thriving than the manufacturers, although they ask not nor receive any tribute from their fellow-citizens.) The sum paid by about 6,000,000 of the population is enormous; at the rate of \$15 *per capita* on woollens in tax to Government, and tribute to

the manufacturer, if they wear home-made cloths -	\$90,000,000
Tax and tribute paid on cotton cloth by 12,000,000 of people—\$5 each -	60,000,000
Tax and tribute paid on iron by most of the people to keep blacksmiths and hardware manufacturers <i>out</i> of employment in the United States, and by an unnatural law force that industry to Birmingham and Sheffield—sum paid for that purpose -	13,000,000
Total sum paid by the people on only three articles -	<u>163,000,000</u>

Of these \$163,000,000, probably not \$10,000,000 of this sum goes into the Treasury, and the other \$153,000,000 are paid to the manufacturers, who, in all probability, are not 133,514 in number, of all ages and sexes, who have *chosen* to work in unprofitable trades, being for each so kept employed \$1,220 $\frac{1}{3}$. That is to say, to raise the sum of \$10,000,000, a tribute or poor's rate to the amount of \$153,000,000 is annually paid to the manufacturers by a comparatively small part of the community, who consumes the produce of the American manufacturers, and taxable imported articles. The sum thus paid is upwards of fifteen times the amount paid in to the Treasury, and is as much capital annihilated, because by turning our industry to the channel prepared by nature, we should save that sum, by exchanging our industry with that of others who excel us in other channels of industry, as we do them in those who are natural to us.

How long are we going to pay such enormous sums to keep less than 200,000 paupers? and annihilate our commerce, in which more than *ten times* their number find a profitable employment, and need no poor's rate from their fellow citizens.

In the cities of Boston, New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, Richmond, Charleston, Savannah, and New Orleans, with the shipping that belongs to and trade with them, there is more than five times the number of people employed, and more than six times the amount of provisions, and produce of all kinds, consumed; the consumption is not only for the population of those cities, but by and for the crews of the ships that trade there, and for their passages out, and back often times. Yet this immense interest appears to be entirely overlooked, hampered, and injured, to foster a comparatively few manufacturers, at a most enormous sacrifice of money, as has just been shown. Should we add to the former employed in commerce, the immense number employed in all the departments of agriculture who need no support from Government, although some few wool-growers ask it (yet in England, where the annual rent and other incumbrance on land, the duty is only one penny or two cents per pound, or about two and a half per cent., yet these pay as much and more rent, poor's rates, titles, &c., per annum, as land sells for in fee in many parts of the United States), and are more with their families than 10,000,000 of people. When compared with the other classes, the manufacturers needing *protection*, as they call it, poor's rates, the proper name, falls into utter insignificance.

Of our exports for 1838, rice, tobacco, and cotton, amounted to \$70,000,000, out of \$96,000,000; and in 1839, similar produce amounted to \$73,500,000, out of \$103,500,000. For these, and the other exports, every pound and bushel of which was *home industry*, we received woollen and cotton cloths, iron, and other articles, on which taxes to the amount of from 25 to 300 per cent. were paid. Supposing we were like Switzerland and the

Channel island, have no custom-houses nor tariffs, in such case the growers would have had 100 pounds of iron, that pays 100 per cent., whereas they only received 50 pounds, and only 25 of that paying 300 per cent. Of cotton cloth they would on an average receive 100 yards, whereas they only receive 50 on plain white, the duty average 100 per cent.; on prints about the same. Mr. Marshall, at page 156, report number 115, before quoted, said: "On cotton of one yard wide, made of number 35 yarn, and in the 1,200 reed, the operative duty is at this time just 70 per cent. on the cost in England; the other charges, viz., insurance, boxing, freight, commission, &c., 25 per cent.," making, together, 100 per cent.; and at the next page (157) he asks for two cents the running yard more, or about 20 per cent more; and of woollens he would receive 100 yards, but under a duty of 40 per cent., he only receives 60 yards. Under the free system those who supply foreign markets with rice, cotton, tobacco, and bread stuffs, &c., would supply the wants of their fellow citizens in the foregoing proportion, viz., 100 yards of woollens where they only now get 60 yards, paying the amount of the other 40 yards in tribute to the manufacturer, or in taxes to the Government; and in cottons 100 yards for the same amount of money they now pay for 50 yards; in iron still more in proportion. It is not only the amount of tax to the Government, and the tribute to the manufacturer, that is objectionable, but the tendency to *restrict* the markets of our exports, and the diminution in the consumption. If cotton goods were at half the price they now are, the consumption in this country would be doubled; England for her home use consumes 600,000 bales of American cotton, and that of the best quality, and exports 300,000 bales more, half of which goes to her colonies; in all 750,000 bales out of 900,000 used by British subjects. And yet the country that is to us so good a customer, we shut her cotton manufacture out of our ports, and restrict the consumption by American consumers one half; this, indeed, is paying pretty high for the whistle, yet some of the manufacturers or their friends have had the *madness* to pretend that they had opened another market for American cotton, when in point of fact they have only divided a market already existing, and considerably reduced the demand, by *advancing* the price. Open your ports free to cotton goods, and next year this country will consume 100,000 bales of cotton more than it has done this, supposing they now consume 200,000 bales manufactured in the United States. I know the manufacturers say they manufacture 300,000, and some say 350,000 bales, but I do not believe they can prove any such thing; but admitting they do then reduce the prices of cotton goods to half what it is now, as it would be if it was made free, and the consumption will be doubled, so that in a few years we would, with the same population, *consume* 750,000 bales. I have before shown that what retails in England at two cents per yard sells wholesale here at six cents, and that in Manchester 25 yards of good piece goods sold at three shillings, or seventy-two cents the piece.

Suppose, then, a tax of \$2 per capita was laid on the whole people, it would produce upward of \$34,000,000 gross, with the revenue from the public lands, more than enough to support Government, and bear on every one alike, as every one receives, or ought to receive, protection at the hand of Government, all ought to help to support it. But now that the revenue is raised on imports, the burden falls on a very small part, comparatively speaking, of the community, on those only who consume taxable *imported* articles. The farmer who manufactures his own cloth, &c., pays little or nothing to the support of Government, neither does the manufacturer.

But as the free trade party agreed in 1833 that the duties should be levied on imports at the rate of 20 per cent. home valuation (which has always been the case previous to the law of 1832, by adding 10 per cent. as the profit of the merchant, freight, &c., on goods from this side the Cape of Good Hope, and 20 per cent. on goods from the other side of that cape, which made the duty 10 and 20 per cent. higher than if it had been levied on the first cost of the goods), I think the free trade party are bound by that contract. If the manufacturers and their friends keep to their part of the agreement, then let the taxes be levied on all the imports equally at an ad valorem rate, without exception of a single article. If not so done, then let the support of Government be taken per capita, and each pay his proportion, each State paying for their poor, then the burden will be borne alike. I contend that those only who support the General Government ought to have a vote in it, and this principle is recognised in every State having poor laws. It is those that pay, and not those who receive, that regulate the keeping of the poor institutions. How differently with the pauper manufacturers, I mean those who receive support from their fellow-citizens. If the principle is right in one case, why not in the other?

It is stated by Mr. Jelinger E. Simons, in his "Arts and Artisans at Home and Abroad," page 71, "that the working classes of Switzerland enjoy a greater amount of physical comfort and mental cultivation than the working classes of any European continental community." The Channel islands, like Switzerland, have no tariff, yet the population is one thousand and upward to the square mile, and is said of the inhabitants "that they are the most flourishing people in the British Empire." This proves the fact that high duties or any tariff at all is no way connected with the well-being of the nations or people; on the reverse, the countries without custom-houses are the happiest. It cannot be otherwise, as the tax on imports is always bearing harder on some part of the community than on others, but more particularly so when duties are intended to be prohibitory, as I have shown that many are so intended by the Secretary's bill.

Your petitioner, therefore, prays that your honorable House lay duties on imports only in conformity to the compromise law. That agreement was as solemn as that between individuals; and the Senate being the highest legislative body and court of the country, ought, therefore, to show an example to the people worthy their imitation, by sanctioning no bill imposing duties on imports except in unity with that agreement. A uniform ad valorem duty would tend to lessen the cost of collection materially, as it would dispense with weighers, measurers, &c., and prevent disputes and law suits.

If a uniform ad valorem duty on all imports, without exception, cannot be agreed to by both Houses of Congress, then that a uniform tax per capita in federal numbers be laid in lieu of duties on imports, that being the most just and equitable mode of defraying the expenses of Government, particularly so in a country passing through so many degrees of latitude, where what operates in favor of one section may have a direct opposite effect on other sections of the country.

Your memorialist, therefore, prays that your honorable body grant his prayer, and he will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

JOHN SARCHET.

PHILADELPHIA, *July 20, 1842.*